arXiv:1303.3335v1 [math.CV] 14 Mar 2013

NEARGEODESICS IN JOHN DOMAINS IN BANACH SPACES

YAXIANG LI

Abstract. Let E be a real Banach space with dimension at least 2. In this paper, we prove that if $D \subset E$ is a John domain which is homeomorphic to an inner uniform domain via a CQH map, then each neargeodesic in D is a cone arc.

1. Introduction

Throughout the paper, we always assume that E denotes a real Banach space with dimension at least 2. The norm of a vector z in E is written as $|z|$, and for each pair of points z_1, z_2 in E, the distance between them is denoted by $|z_1 - z_2|$, the closed line segment with endpoints z_1 and z_2 by $[z_1, z_2]$. We always use $\mathbb{B}(x_0, r)$ to denote the open ball $\{x \in E : |x - x_0| < r\}$ centered at x_0 with radius $r > 0$. Similarly, for the closed balls and spheres, we use the usual notations $\overline{\mathbb{B}}(x_0, r)$ and $S(x_0, r)$, respectively.

Definition 1. A domain D in E is called *c-John domain* in the norm metric provided there exists a constant c with the property that each pair of points z_1, z_2 in D can be joined by a rectifiable arc α in D such that for all $z \in \alpha$ the following holds:

$$\min\{\ell(\alpha[z_1, z]),\ \ell(\alpha[z_2, z])\} \leq c\, d_D(z), \tag{1.1}$$

where $d_D(z)$ denotes the distance from z to the boundary ∂D of D, $\ell(\alpha)$ denotes the length of α, $\alpha[z_j, z]$ the part of α between z_j and z (cf. [2, 12, 13, 14]). The arc α is called to be a *c-cone arc* .

For z_1, $z_2 \in D$, the *inner length metric* $\lambda_D(z_1, z_2)$ between them is defined by

$$\lambda_D(z_1, z_2) = \inf\{\ell(\alpha) : \ \alpha \subset D \text{ is a rectifiable arc joining } z_1 \text{ and } z_2\}.$$

We say that a domain D in E is *an inner c-uniform domain* if there is a constant $c \geq 1$ such that each pair of points $z_1, z_2 \in D$ can be joined by an arc α satisfying (1.1) and

$$\ell(\alpha) \leq c\lambda_D(z_1, z_2).$$

Such an arc α is called to be an *inner c-uniform arc* (cf. [19]).

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 30C65, 30F45; Secondary: 30C20.

Key words and phrases. John domain, neargeodesic, cone arc, inner uniform domain, CQH homeomorphism.

* Corresponding author.

† File: ngeo˙John˙final.tex, printed: 2013-3-15, 1.31.

The research was partly supported by NSFs of China (No. 11101138 and 11071063) and Hunan Provincial Innovation Foundation For Postgraduate.

Obviously, an inner uniform domain is a John domain, but the converse is not always true. See[3, 9, 10, 19] for more details on John domains and inner uniform domains.

This paper grew out from the following question[6, 8]: Suppose that $D \subset E$ is a c-John domain and that γ is a c_0-neargeodesic in D. Is γ a b-cone arc for some $b = b(c, c_0)$? In [6], Gehring, Hag and Martio discussed this question for the case $E = \mathbb{R}^2$ and got that if $D \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a simply connected John domain, then every quasihyperbolic or hyperbolic geodesic in D is a cone arc. In [3, Theorem 7.12], Bonk, Heinonen and Koskela proved that if $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a John domain which is homeomorphic to an inner uniform domain via a quasiconformal maps, then each quasihyperbolic geodesic in D is a cone arc. In this paper, we show that if $D \subset E$ is a John domain which is homeomorphic to an inner uniform domain via a CQH maps, then each neargeodesic in D is a cone arc. Note that CQH maps is a generalization of quasiconformal maps. So even for the case $E = \mathbb{R}^n$, our result is new.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that $D \subset E$ is an a-John domain which is homeomorphic to an inner c-uniform domain via an (M,C)-CQH. Let z_1, $z_2 \in D$ and γ be a c_0-neargeodesic joining z_1 and z_2 in D. Then γ is an a'-cone arc, where the positive constant a' depends only on a, c, c_0, C and M.*

The organization of this paper is as follows. In section 3, we prove several lemmas which is critical to the proof of our main result and in section 4, we will prove Theorem 1. In section 2, some preliminaries are stated.

2. Preliminaries

The *quasihyperbolic length* of a rectifiable arc or a path γ in D is the number (cf. [1, 4, 5, 17])

$$\ell_k(\gamma) = \int_\gamma \frac{1}{d_D(z)}\,|dz|.$$

For each pair of points z_1, z_2 in D, the *quasihyperbolic distance* $k_D(z_1, z_2)$ between z_1 and z_2 is defined in the usual way:

$$k_D(z_1, z_2) = \inf \ell_k(\alpha),$$

where the infimum is taken over all rectifiable arcs α joining z_1 to z_2 in D.

For all z_1, z_2 in D, we have (cf. [17])

$$k_D(z_1, z_2) \geq \log\Big(1 + \frac{\lambda_D(z_1, z_2)}{\min\{d_D(z_1), d_D(z_2)\}}\Big) \geq \Big|\log \frac{d_D(z_2)}{d_D(z_1)}\Big|. \tag{2.1}$$

Moreover, if $|z_1 - z_2| < d_D(z_1)$, we have [20, Lemma 3.7]

$$k_D(z_1, z_2) < \log\Big(1 + \frac{|z_1 - z_2|}{d_D(z_1) - |z_1 - z_2|}\Big). \tag{2.2}$$

Gehring and Palka [5] introduced the quasihyperbolic metric of a domain in R^n, and it has been recently used by many authors in the study of quasiconformal mappings and related questions [4, 7, 11, 15] etc. Recall that an arc α from z_1 to z_2 is a *quasihyperbolic geodesic* if $\ell_k(\alpha) = k_D(z_1, z_2)$. Obviously, each subarc of a quasihyperbolic geodesic is a quasihyperbolic geodesic. It is known that a quasihyperbolic geodesic between every pair of points in E exists if the dimension of E is finite, see [4, Lemma 1]. This is not true in infinite dimensional Banach spaces (cf. [17, Example 2.9]). In order to remedy this shortage, Väisälä introduced the following concepts [18].

Definition 2. Let $D \neq E$ and $c \geq 1$. An arc $\alpha \subset D$ is a c-neargeodesic if $\ell_k(\alpha[x,y]) \leq c\, k_D(x,y)$ for all $x, y \in \alpha$.

In [18], Väisälä proved the following property concerning the existence of neargeodesics in E.

Theorem A. ([18, Theorem 3.3]) *Let $\{z_1,\, z_2\} \subset D$ and $c > 1$. Then there is a c-neargeodesic in D joining z_1 and z_2.*

Now let's recall the following characterization of inner uniform domains, which is due to Väisälä.

Theorem B. ([19, Theorem 2.33]) *A domain $D \subset E$ is an inner c-uniform domain if and only if $k_D(x,y) \leq c'\ \log\left(1+\frac{\lambda_D(x,y)}{\min\{d_D(x), d_D(y)\}}\right)$ for all $x, y \in D$, where the constants c and c' depend only on each other.*

As a generalization of quasiconformal maps, Väisälä introduced CQH homeomorphisms (cf. [16, 18]).

Definition 3. Suppose $f : D \mapsto D'$ is a homeomorphism. Then f is said to be *C-coarsely M-quasihyperbolic*, or briefly (M, C)-CQH, if it satisfies

$$\frac{k_D(x,y)-C}{M} \leq k_{D'}(f(x), f(y)) \leq M\ k_D(x,y) + C$$

for all $x,\, y \in D$.

3. Properties of cone arcs

In what follows, we always assume that $f : D \mapsto D'$ is an (M, C)-CQH map. Also we use x, y, z, $\cdots$ to denote the points in D, and x', y', z', $\cdots$ the images of x, y, z, $\cdots$ in D', respectively, under f. For arcs α, β, γ, $\cdots$ in D, we also use α', β', γ', $\cdots$ to denote their images in D'.

For x, $y \in D$, let β be an arc joining x and y in D. We come to determine some special points on β'.

3.1. **Determination of special points on β'.** Without loss of generality, we may assume that $d_{D'}(y') \geq d_{D'}(x')$. Then there must exist a point $w_0' \in \beta'$ which is the first point along the direction from x' to y' such that

$$d_{D'}(w_0') = \sup_{p' \in \beta'} d_{D'}(p').$$

It is possible that $w_0' = x'$ or y'. Obviously, there exists a nonnegative integer m such that

$$2^m\, d_{D'}(x') \le d_{D'}(w_0') < 2^{m+1}\, d_{D'}(x'),$$

and x_0' the first point in $\beta'[x', w_0']$ from x' to w_0' with

$$d_{D'}(x_0') = 2^m\, d_{D'}(x').$$

Let $x_1' = x'$. If $x_0' = x_1'$, we let $x_2' = w_0'$. It is possible that $x_1' = x_2'$. If $x_0' \neq x_1'$, then we let $x_2', \dots, x_{m+1}' \in \beta'[x', x_0']$ be the points such that for each $i \in \{2, \dots, m+1\}$, x_i' denotes the first point from x' to x_0' with

$$d_{D'}(x_i') = 2^{i-1}\, d_{D'}(x_1').$$

Obviously, $x_{m+1}' = x_0'$. If $x_0' \neq w_0'$, then we use x_{m+2}' to denote w_0'.

In a similar way, let $s \ge 0$ be the integer such that

$$2^s\, d_{D'}(y') \le d_{D'}(w_0') < 2^{s+1}\, d_{D'}(y'),$$

and $x_{1,0}'$ the first point in $\beta'[y', x_{1,0}']$ from y' to $x_{1,0}'$ with

$$d_{D'}(x_{1,0}') = 2^s\, d_{D'}(y').$$

Let $x_{1,1}' = y'$. If $x_{1,0}' = x_{1,1}'$, we let $x_{1,2}' = x_{1,0}'$. It is possible that $x_{1,2}' = x_{1,1}'$. If $x_{1,0}' \neq y'$, then we let $x_{1,2}', \dots, x_{1,s+1}'$ be the points in $\beta'[y', w_0']$ such that for each $j \in \{2, \dots, s+1\}$, $x_{1,j}'$ is the first point from $x_{1,1}'$ to w_0' with

$$d_{D'}(x_{1,j}') = 2^{j-1}\, d_{D'}(x_{1,1}').$$

Then $x_{1,s+1}' = x_{1,0}'$. If $x_{1,0}' \neq w_0'$, we let $x_{1,s+2}' = w_0'$.

3.2. **Elementary properties.** In the following, we assume that for $a, c_0 \ge 1$ and for each $s_1,\ s_2 \in \beta$,

$$\ell_k(\beta[s_1, s_2]) \le 4a^2c_0k_D(s_1, s_2) + 4a^2c_0. \tag{3.1}$$

Obviously, (3.1) is satisfied for each c_0-neargeodesic.

Lemma 1. *For any $k \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$ and $z' \in \beta'[x_k', x_{k+1}']$,*

1. *$d_{D'}(x_{k+1}') \le a_2\, d_{D'}(z')$;*
2. *$\lambda_{D'}(x_{k+1}', x_k') \le a_2\, d_{D'}(z')$ and*
3. *$\max\{\lambda_{D'}(z', x_k'), \lambda_{D'}(x_{k+1}', z')\} \le a_2\, d_{D'}(z')$,*

where $a_2 = (1+2a_1)^{4a^2c_0c'M^2+1}e^{C+4a^2c_0M+4a^2c_0CM}$, $a_1 = e^{3(C+1)(a_0+M)}$ and $a_0 = 2^4[c' + 4a^2c_0c'M + C + 4a^2c_0]^4$. Here and in what follows, $[\cdot]$ always denotes the greatest integer part.

Proof. At first, we prove the following inequality: For any $k \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$,

$$\lambda_{D'}(x_{k+1}', x_k') < a_1\, d_{D'}(x_{k+1}'). \tag{3.2}$$

We prove this inequality by contradiction. Suppose

$$\lambda_{D'}(x_{k+1}', x_k') \ge a_1\, d_{D'}(x_{k+1}'). \tag{3.3}$$

Let $y'_{k,1}, y'_{k,2}, \cdots, y'_{k,a_0+1} \in \beta'[x'_k, x'_{k+1}]$ be a_0+1 points such that $y'_{k,1} = x'_k$, $y'_{k,a_0+1} = x'_{k+1}$ and $\lambda_{D'}(y'_{k,i+1}, y'_{k,i}) \geq \frac{\lambda_{D'}(x'_k, x'_{k+1})}{a_0}$. Then for each $i \in \{1, 2, \cdots, a_0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} k_{D'}(y'_{k,i}, y'_{k,i+1}) &\geq \log\Big(1 + \frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_{k,i+1}, y'_{k,i})}{\min\{d_{D'}(y'_{k,i+1}), d_{D'}(y'_{k,i})\}}\Big) \\ &\geq \log\Big(1 + \frac{\lambda_{D'}(x'_k, x'_{k+1})}{2a_0 d_{D'}(x'_k)}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

We see from (3.1) and Theorem B that

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 \log\Big(1 + \frac{\lambda_{D'}(x'_k, x'_{k+1})}{2a_0 d_{D'}(x'_k)}\Big) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{a_0} k_{D'}(y'_{k,i}, y'_{k,i+1}) \\ &\leq M \sum_{i=1}^{a_0} k_D(y_{k,i}, y_{k,i+1}) + a_0 C \\ &\leq M\ell_k(\beta[x_k, x_{k+1}]) + a_0 C \\ &\leq 4a^2c_0 M k_D(x_k, x_{k+1}) + 4a^2c_0M + a_0C \\ &\leq 4a^2c_0M^2 k_{D'}(x'_k, x'_{k+1}) + (a_0 + 4a^2c_0M)C + 4a^2c_0M \\ &\leq 4a^2c_0c'M^2 \log\Big(1 + \frac{\lambda_{D'}(x'_k, x'_{k+1})}{d_{D'}(x'_k)}\Big) \\ &\quad +(a_0 + 4a^2c_0M)C + 4a^2c_0M, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$a_0 \log\Big(1 + \frac{\lambda_{D'}(x'_k, x'_{k+1})}{2a_0 d_{D'}(x'_k)}\Big) \leq 8a^2c'M^2 \ \log\Big(1 + \frac{\lambda_{D'}(x'_k, x'_{k+1})}{d_{D'}(x'_k)}\Big),$$

which contradicts with (3.3). Hence (3.2) holds.

We infer from (3.2) that for any $z' \in \beta'[x'_k, x'_{k+1}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \log\frac{d_{D'}(x'_{k+1})}{d_{D'}(z')} &< k_{D'}(z', x'_{k+1}) \\ &\leq Mk_D(z, x_{k+1}) + C \\ &\leq M\ell_k(\beta[x_k, x_{k+1}]) + C \\ &\leq 4a^2c_0M\ k_D(x_k, x_{k+1}) + C + 4a^2c_0M \\ &\leq 4a^2c_0M^2\ k_{D'}(x'_k, x'_{k+1}) + 4a^2c_0CM + C + 4a^2c_0M \\ &\leq 4a^2c_0c'M^2\ \log\Big(1 + \frac{\lambda_{D'}(x'_k, x'_{k+1})}{d_{D'}(x'_k)}\Big) \\ &\quad +C + 4a^2c_0CM + 4a^2c_0M \\ &\leq 4a^2c_0c'M^2\ \log(1 + 2a_1) + C + 4a^2c_0CM + 4a^2c_0M, \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

which implies that Lemma 1 (1) holds. (3.2) and (3.4) yield that

$$\lambda_{D'}(x'_k, x'_{k+1}) \le (1+2a_1)^{4a^2c_0c'M^2+1} e^{4a^2c_0CM+4a^2c_0M+C}\ d_{D'}(z'),$$

whence Lemma 1 (2) follows.

Obviously,

$$\begin{aligned}
\log\Big(1+\frac{\lambda_{D'}(x'_k, z')}{d_{D'}(z')}\Big) &\le k_{D'}(x'_k, z') \\
&\le Mk_D(x_k, z) + C \\
&\le M\ell_k(\beta[x_k, x_{k+1}]) + C \\
&\le 4a^2c_0Mk_D(x_k, x_{k+1}) + 4a^2c_0M + C \\
&\le 4a^2c_0c^2\ k_{D'}(x'_k, x'_{k+1}) + C + 4a^2c_0M + 4a^2c_0CM \\
&\le 4a^2c_0c'M^2\ \log\Big(1+\frac{\lambda_{D'}(x'_k, x'_{k+1})}{d_{D'}(x'_k)}\Big) \\
&\quad +C + 4a^2c_0M + 4a^2c_0CM,
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (3.2), yields

$$\lambda_{D'}(x'_k, z') \le (1+2a_1)^{4a^2c_0c'M^2} e^{C+4a^2c_0M+4a^2c_0CM}\ d_{D'}(z'). \tag{3.5}$$

The similar discussion as in (3.5) shows that

$$\lambda_{D'}(z', x'_{k+1}) \le (1+2a_1)^{4a^2c_0c'M^2} e^{C+4a^2c_0M+4a^2c_0CM}\ d_{D'}(z'). \tag{3.6}$$

The combination of (3.5) and (3.6) shows that Lemma 1 (3) holds. □

The following two results easily follow from the similar reasoning as in the proof of Lemma 1.

Corollary 1. *For any $k \in \{1, \cdots, s\}$ and $z' \in \beta'[x'_{1,k}, x'_{1,k+1}]$,*

1. *$d(x'_{1,k+1}) \le a_2\ d_{D'}(z')$;*
2. *$\lambda_{D'}(x'_{1,k+1}, x'_{1,k}) \le a_2\ d_{D'}(z')$ and*
3. *$\max\{\lambda_{D'}(x'_{1,k}, z'), \lambda_{D'}(x'_{1,k+1}, z')\} \le a_2\ d_{D'}(z')$.*

Corollary 2. *For any $z' \in \beta'[x'_{m+1}, x'_{1,s+1}]$,*

1. *$d_{D'}(w'_0) \le a_2\ d_{D'}(z')$;*
2. *$\lambda_{D'}(x'_{m+1}, x'_{1,s+1}) \le a_2\ d_{D'}(z')$ and*
3. *$\max\{\lambda_{D'}(x'_{m+1}, z'), \lambda_{D'}(x'_{1,s+1}, z')\} \le a_2\ d_{D'}(z')$.*

Lemma 2. *For any $z' \in \beta'[x', w'_0]$,*

$$\lambda_{D'}(x', z') \le a_3\ d_{D'}(z'),$$

where $a_3 = a_2 + a_2^2$.

Proof. If $z' \in \beta'[x', x'_{m+1}]$, then there exists some $k \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$ such that $z' \in \beta'[x'_k, x'_{k+1}]$. If $k = 1$, then the result easily follows from Lemma 1. If $k > 1$, then by Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{D'}(x', z') &\leq \lambda_{D'}(x'_1, x'_2) + \cdots + \lambda_{D'}(x'_{k-1}, x'_k) + \lambda_{D'}(x'_k, z') \\ &\leq a_2\big(d_{D'}(x'_1) + \cdots + d_{D'}(x'_{k-1}) + d_{D'}(z')\big) \\ &\leq (a_2 + \frac{1}{2}a_2^2)d_{D'}(z').\end{aligned}$$

Now we consider the case $z' \in \beta'[x'_{m+1}, w'_0]$. Then we infer from Lemma 1 and Corollary 2 that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{D'}(x', z') &\leq a_2\big(d_{D'}(x'_1) + d_{D'}(x'_2) + \cdots + d_{D'}(x'_m) + d_{D'}(z')\big) \\ &\leq a_2\big(d_{D'}(x'_{m+1}) + d_{D'}(z')\big) \\ &\leq (a_2 + a_2^2)d_{D'}(z').\end{aligned}$$

Hence the lemma holds. □

Similarly, we have

Corollary 3. *For any* $z' \in \beta'[y', w'_0]$,

$$\lambda_{D'}(y', z') \leq a_3\, d_{D'}(z').$$

where a_3 *is the same as in Lemma 2.*

Suppose that D is an a-John domain. Then there exists an a-cone arc α in D joining x and y. Let s_0 bisect α. Then

Lemma 3. *Let* $u \in \alpha[x, s_0]$ *and* $v \in \alpha[s_0, y]$. *Then for each* $z \in \alpha[u, s_0]$, $d_D(z) \geq \frac{2\ell(\alpha[u,z])+d_D(u)}{4a}$, *and for each* $z \in \alpha[s_0, v]$, $d_D(z) \geq \frac{2\ell(\alpha[v,z])+d_D(v)}{4a}$.

Proof. It suffices to prove the first statement since the proof for the second one is similar. For each $z \in \alpha[u, s_0]$, $d_D(z) \geq \frac{\ell(\alpha[u,z])}{a}$. If $\alpha[u, z] \subset \mathbb{B}(z, \frac{d_D(u)}{2})$, then $d_D(z) \geq \frac{d_D(u)}{2}$. Otherwise, $d_D(z) \geq \frac{d_D(u)}{2a}$. Hence $d_D(z) \geq \frac{2\ell(\alpha[u,z])+d_D(u)}{4a}$. □

Lemma 4. (3.1) *holds for each* s_1, $s_2 \in \alpha[x, s_0]$ (*or* $\alpha[x, s_0]$).

Proof. It suffices to prove the first case since the proof for the second one is similar. Lemma 3 yields that for each $s_1, s_2 \in \alpha[x, s_0]$,

$$\begin{aligned}k_D(s_1, s_2) &\leq \ell_k(\alpha[s_1, s_2]) \\ &= \int_{\alpha[s_1,s_2]} \frac{|dz|}{d_D(z)} \\ &\leq 4a^2 \log\Big(1 + \frac{d_D(s_2)}{d_D(s_1)}\Big) \\ &\leq 4a^2 c_0 k_D(s_1, s_2) + 4a^2 c_0,\end{aligned}$$

from which the proof follows. $\square$

Let $d_{D'}(v_1') = \max\{d_{D'}(u') : u' \in \alpha'[x', s_0']\}$ and $d_{D'}(v_2') = \max\{d_{D'}(u') : u' \in \alpha'[y', s_0']\}$. Hence it follows from Lemma 2 and Corollary 3 that

Lemma 5. *For each* $z' \in \alpha'[x', v_1']$, $\lambda_{D'}(x', z') \leq a_3\ d_{D'}(z')$ *and for each* $z' \in \alpha'[v_1', s_0']$, $\lambda_{D'}(s_0', z') \leq a_3\ d_{D'}(z')$.

Similarly,

Corollary 4. *For each* $z' \in \alpha'[y', v_2']$, $\lambda_{D'}(y', z') \leq a_3\ d_{D'}(z')$ *and for each* $z' \in \alpha'[v_2', s_0']$, $\lambda_{D'}(s_0', z') \leq a_3\ d_{D'}(z')$.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Let z_1, $z_2 \in D$ and γ be a c_0-neargeodesic joining z_1, z_2 in D. In the following, we prove that γ is a b_1-cone arc, that is, for each $y \in \gamma$,

$$\min\{\ell(\gamma[z_1, y]),\ \ell(\gamma[z_2, y])\} \leq b_1\, d_D(y), \tag{4.1}$$

where $b_1 = 4a_4 c_0 e^{a_4 c_0}$, $a_4 = a_5^{2c'M}$, $a_5 = a_6^{4a^2 c_0 M + C}$ and $a_6 = (8a_3)^{4c'c_0 M} b^2 e^{2C}$. It is no loss of generality to assume that $d_D(z_1) \leq d_D(z_2)$.

Let $x_0 \in \gamma[z_1, z_2]$ be such that

$$d_D(x_0) = \max_{z \in \gamma[z_1, z_2]} d_D(z).$$

Then there exists an integer $t_1 \geq 0$ such that

$$2^{t_1}\, d_D(z_1) \leq d_D(x_0) < 2^{t_1+1}\, d_D(z_1).$$

Let y_0 be the first point in $\gamma[z_1, x_0]$ from z_1 to x_0 with

$$d_D(y_0) = 2^{t_1}\, d_D(z_1).$$

Observe that if $d_D(x_0) = d_D(z_1)$, then $y_0 = z_1 = x_0$.

Let $y_1 = z_1$. If $z_1 = y_0$, we let $y_2 = x_0$. It is possible that $y_2 = y_1$. If $z_1 \neq y_0$, then we let $y_2, \dots, y_{t_1+1}$ be the points such that for each $i \in \{2, \dots, t_1 + 1\}$, y_i denotes the first point in $\gamma[z_1, x_0]$ from y_1 to x_0 satisfying

$$d_D(y_i) = 2^{i-1}\, d_D(y_1).$$

Then $y_{t_1+1} = y_0$. We let $y_{t_1+2} = x_0$. It is possible that $y_{t_1+2} = y_{t_1+1} = x_0 = y_0$. This possibility occurs once $x_0 = y_0$. Now we are going to prove for each $i \in \{1, \dots, t_1+1\}$,

$$k_D(y_i, y_{i+1}) \leq a_4. \tag{4.2}$$

For each fixed $i \in \{1, \dots, t_1 + 1\}$, let α_i be an a-cone arc joining y_i and y_{i+1} in D and let v_i bisect α_i. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $d_{D'}(y_i') \leq d_{D'}(y_{i+1}')$.

For each $z \in \alpha_i[y_i, v_i]$, Lemma 3 implies that

$$k_D(y_i, z) \leq \ell_k(\alpha_i[y_i, z]) \leq 2a \log\Big(1 + \frac{2\ell(\alpha_i[y_i, z])}{d_D(y_i)}\Big). \tag{4.3}$$

Similarly, for each $z \in \alpha_i[y_{i+1}, v_i]$, we have

$$k_D(y_{i+1}, z) \leq 2a \log\Big(1 + \frac{2\ell(\alpha_i[y_{i+1}, z])}{d_D(y_{i+1})}\Big).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} k_D(y_i, y_{i+1}) &\leq k_D(y_i, v_i) + k_D(y_{i+1}, v_i) \\ &\leq 2a\Big(\log\Big(1 + \frac{2\ell(\alpha_i[y_{i+1}, v_i])}{d_D(y_{i+1})}\Big) \\ &\qquad + \log\Big(1 + \frac{2\ell(\alpha_i[y_i, v_i])}{d_D(y_i)}\Big)\Big) \\ &\leq 4a \log\Big(1 + \frac{\ell(\alpha_i)}{d_D(y_i)}\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

If $d_D(y_i) > \lambda_D(y_i, y_{i+1})$, then $k_D(y_i, y_{i+1}) \leq 2$. Hence in the following, we assume that

$$d_D(y_i) \leq \lambda_D(y_i, y_{i+1}), \tag{4.5}$$

and we divide the proof of (4.2) into two cases.

Case 1. $\ell(\alpha_i) < a_5\lambda_D(y_i, y_{i+1})$.

Then (4.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\ell(\gamma[y_i, y_{i+1}])}{2d_D(y_i)} &\leq \ell_k(\gamma[y_i, y_{i+1}]) \\ &\leq c_0 k_D(y_i, y_{i+1}) \\ &\leq 4ac_0 \log\Big(1 + \frac{\ell(\alpha_i)}{d_D(y_i)}\Big) \\ &\leq 4ac_0 \log\Big(1 + \frac{a_5\lambda_D(y_i, y_{i+1})}{d_D(y_i)}\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

A necessary condition for (4.6) is

$$\lambda_D(y_i, y_{i+1}) \leq a_5^2\, d_D(y_i). \tag{4.7}$$

Hence (4.6) implies that $k_D(y_i, y_{i+1}) \leq a_4$.

Case 2. $\ell(\alpha_i) \geq a_5\lambda_D(y_i, y_{i+1})$.

We consider this case by a contradiction. Suppose that

$$k_D(y_i, y_{i+1}) > a_4, \tag{4.8}$$

which implies that

$$k_{D'}(y_i', y_{i+1}') > \frac{k_D(y_i, y_{i+1}) - C}{M} > 1. \tag{4.9}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} a_4 &< k_D(y_i, y_{i+1}) \\ &\le Mk_{D'}(y_i', y_{i+1}') + C \\ &\le c'M \log\Big(1 + \frac{\lambda_{D'}(y_i', y_{i+1}')}{d_{D'}(y_i')}\Big) + C, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\lambda_{D'}(y_i', y_{i+1}') \ge a_5 d_{D'}(y_i'). \tag{4.10}$$

Hence

$$d_D(v_i) \ge \frac{\ell(\alpha_i)}{2a} \ge \frac{a_5}{2a}\lambda_D(y_i, y_{i+1}) > a_6\, \lambda_D(y_i, y_{i+1}).$$

Then (4.5) guarantees that there exists $v_{i,0} \in \alpha_i[y_i, v_i]$ such that

$$d_D(v_{i,0}) = a_6\, \lambda_D(y_i, y_{i+1}). \tag{4.11}$$

Claim 1. $k_D(y_i, v_{i,0}) \le \frac{1}{a_5} k_D(y_i, y_{i+1})$.

We prove this Claim also by a contradiction. Suppose that

$$k_D(y_i, v_{i,0}) > \frac{1}{a_5} k_D(y_i, y_{i+1}).$$

Then (4.3) yields,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\ell(\gamma[y_i, y_{i+1}])}{2d_D(y_i)} &\le \ell_k(\gamma[y_i, y_{i+1}]) \\ &\le c_0 k_D(y_i, y_{i+1}) \\ &\le a_5 c_0 k_D(y_i, v_{i,0}) \\ &\le 4aa_5c_0 \log\Big(1 + \frac{\ell(\alpha_i[y_i, v_{i,0}])}{d_D(y_i)}\Big) \\ &\le 4aa_5c_0 \log\Big(1 + \frac{ad(v_{i,0})}{d_D(y_i)}\Big) \\ &\le 4a^2a_5a_6 \log\Big(1 + \frac{\lambda_D(y_i, y_{i+1})}{d_D(y_i)}\Big), \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\lambda_D(y_i, y_{i+1}) \le a_5^2\, d_D(y_i),$$

which shows that $k_D(y_i, y_{i+1}) \le a_4$ and this is contradict with (4.8). $\square$

By (4.5) and (4.11), we get

$$k_D(y_i, v_{i,0}) \geq \log \frac{d_D(v_{i,0})}{d_D(y_i)} \geq \log a_6 > C.$$

Thus Claim 1, (4.9), (4.3) and (4.10) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\log\Big(1+\frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, v'_{i,0})}{d_{D'}(y'_i)}\Big) &\leq k_{D'}(y'_i, v'_{i,0}) \\
&\leq Mk_D(y_i, v_{i,0}) + C \\
&< 2Mk_D(y_i, v_{i,0}) \\
&\leq \frac{2M}{a_5} k_D(y_i, y_{i+1}) \\
&\leq \frac{2M^2}{a_5} k_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{i+1}) + \frac{2CM}{a_5} \\
&\leq \frac{4c'M^2}{a_5} \log\Big(1+\frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{i+1})}{d_{D'}(y'_i)}\Big) \\
&\leq \log\Big(1+\frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{i+1})}{a_5 d_{D'}(y'_i)}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, v'_{i,0}) < \frac{1}{a_5}\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{i+1}), \tag{4.12}$$

which together with (4.10) give

$$d_{D'}(v'_{i,0}) \leq \lambda_{D'}(y'_i, v'_{i,0}) + d_{D'}(y'_i) \leq \frac{2}{a_5}\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{i+1}). \tag{4.13}$$

Claim 2. $\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, v'_i) < \frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{i+1})}{2}$.

Suppose for the contrary that

$$\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, v'_i) \geq \frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{i+1})}{2}.$$

Let $u'_{0,i} \in \gamma'[y'_i, y'_{i+1}]$ satisfying

$$d_{D'}(u'_{0,i}) = \max\{d_{D'}(w') : w' \in \gamma'[y'_i, y'_{i+1}]\}.$$

Obviously,

$$\max\{\lambda_{D'}(y'_{i+1}, u'_{0,i}), \lambda_{D'}(u'_{0,i}, y'_i)\} \geq \frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{i+1})}{2}.$$

Then we know from Lemma 2 and Corollary 3 that

$$d_{D'}(u'_{0,i}) \geq \frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{i+1})}{2a_3}. \tag{4.14}$$

Hence by Lemma 2 and (4.10), there must exist some point $y'_{0,i} \in \gamma'[y'_i, u'_{0,i}]$ satisfying

$$d_{D'}(y'_{0,i}) = \frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{i+1})}{2a_3} \text{ and } \lambda_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{0,i}) \le a_3\, d_{D'}(y'_{0,i}). \tag{4.15}$$

Let $v'_0 \in \alpha'_i[y'_i, v'_i]$ satisfies $d_{D'}(v'_0) = \max\{d_{D'}(u') : u' \in \alpha'_i[y'_i, v'_i]\}$. Then Lemma 5 shows that for each $z' \in \alpha'_i[v'_0, v'_i]$,

$$\lambda_{D'}(v'_i, z') \le a_3 d_{D'}(z'). \tag{4.16}$$

By (4.12) and (4.13) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{D'}(v'_i, v'_{i,0}) &\ge \lambda_{D'}(v'_i, y'_i) - \lambda_{D'}(v'_{i,0}, y'_i)\\
&\le (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{a_5})\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{i+1})\\
&\le (a_5 - \frac{1}{2})d_{D'}(v'_{i,0}),
\end{aligned}$$

which together with (4.16) shows that $v'_0 \in \alpha'_i[v'_{i,0}, v'_i]$.

Obviously, $\max\{\lambda_{D'}(v'_i, v'_0), \lambda_{D'}(v'_0, y'_i)\} \ge \frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{i+1})}{4}$. We know from Lemma 5 and Corollary 4 that $d_{D'}(v'_0) \ge \frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{i+1})}{4a_3}$. By (4.13) and Lemma 5, we see that there exists some point $u'_0 \in \alpha'_i[v'_{i,0}, v'_i]$ such that

$$d_{D'}(u'_0) = \frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{i+1})}{4a_3} \text{ and } \lambda_{D'}(y'_i, u'_0) \le a_3\, d_{D'}(u'_0). \tag{4.17}$$

Hence (4.15) shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\log\frac{d_D(u_0)}{d_D(y_{0,i})} &\le k_D(y_{0,i}, u_0)\\
&\le Mk_{D'}(y'_{0,i}, u'_0) + C\\
&\le Mc'\log\Big(1 + \frac{\lambda_{D'}(u'_0, y'_{0,i})}{\min\{d_{D'}(u'_0), d_{D'}(y'_{0,i})\}}\Big) + C\\
&\le Mc'\log\Big(1 + \frac{\lambda_{D'}(u'_0, y'_i) + \lambda_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{0,i})}{\min\{d_{D'}(u'_0), d_{D'}(y'_{0,i})\}}\Big) + C\\
&\le Mc'\log\Big(1 + \frac{a_3 d(u'_0) + \lambda_{D'}(y'_i, y'_{0,i})}{\min\{d_{D'}(u'_0), d_{D'}(y'_{0,i})\}}\Big) + C\\
&< Mc'\log(1 + 3a_3) + C,
\end{aligned}$$

which yields that

$$d_D(u_0) \le (1 + 3a_3)^{Mc'} e^C d_D(y_{0,i}). \tag{4.18}$$

Lemma 3, (4.13) and (4.17) make sure that

$$\begin{aligned}4a^2M\log\Big(1+\frac{d_D(u_0)}{d_D(v_{i,0})}\Big)+C &\geq M\ell_k(\alpha_i[v_{i,0},u_0])+C\\ &\geq Mk_D(v_{i,0},u_0)+C\\ &\geq k_{D'}(v'_{i,0},u'_0)\\ &\geq \log\frac{d_{D'}(u'_0)}{d_{D'}(v'_{i,0})}\\ &\geq \log\frac{a_5}{8a_3},\end{aligned}$$

whence $d_D(u_0)\geq a_6d_D(v_{i,0})$. So we infer from (4.5) and (4.11) that

$$d_D(u_0)\geq a_6d_D(v_{i,0})=a_6^2\lambda_D(y_i,y_{i+1})\geq\frac{a_6^2}{2}d_D(y_{i+1})\geq\frac{a_6^2}{2}d_D(y_{0,i}),$$

which contradicts with (4.18). Hence Claim 2 holds. □

It is obvious from Claim 2 that $\lambda_{D'}(y'_{i+1},v'_i)>\frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i,y'_{i+1})}{2}$. Let $q'_0\in\alpha'_i[y'_i,v'_i]$ with

$$\frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i,v'_i)}{2a_3}\geq\lambda_{D'}(q'_0,v'_i)\geq\frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i,v'_i)}{4a_3},\tag{4.19}$$

and $u'_1\in\alpha'_i[y'_{i+1},v'_i]$ with

$$\frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i,v'_i)}{2a_3}\geq\lambda_{D'}(u'_1,v'_i)\geq\frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i,v'_i)}{4a_3}.\tag{4.20}$$

By Lemma 5 and Corollary 4, we get

$$d_{D'}(q'_0)\geq\frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i,v'_i)}{4a_3^2}\ \text{ and }\ d_{D'}(u'_1)\geq\frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i,v'_i)}{4a_3^2}.\tag{4.21}$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\log\frac{d_D(u_1)}{d_D(q_0)}\Big| &\leq k_D(u_1,q_0)\\ &\leq Mk_{D'}(u'_1,q'_0)+C\\ &\leq Mc'\log\Big(1+\frac{\lambda_{D'}(u'_1,q'_0)}{\min\{d_{D'}(q'_0),d_{D'}(u'_1)\}}\Big)+C\\ &\leq Mc'\log\Big(1+\frac{\lambda_{D'}(u'_1,v'_i)+\lambda_{D'}(v'_i,q'_0)}{\min\{d_{D'}(q'_0),d_{D'}(u'_1)\}}\Big)+C\\ &\leq Mc'\log(1+4a_3)+C,\end{aligned}\tag{4.22}$$

which implies that

$$\frac{d_D(u_1)}{(1+4a_3)^{Mc'}e^C}\leq d_D(q_0)\leq(1+4a_3)^{Mc'}e^Cd_D(u_1).\tag{4.23}$$

Claim 3. $d_D(q_0)\geq a_5d_D(v_{i,0})$.

Otherwise, Lemma 3, (4.11), (4.22) and (4.23) show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\ell(\gamma[y_i,y_{i+1}])}{2d_D(y_i)} &\le \ell_k(\gamma[y_i,y_{i+1}]) \\
&\le c_0k_D(y_i,y_{i+1}) \\
&\le c_0(k_D(y_i,q_0)+k_D(q_0,u_1)+k_D(u_1,y_{i+1})) \\
&\le 4a^2c_0\log\Big(1+\frac{d_D(q_0)}{d_D(y_i)}\Big)+Mc'c_0\log\Big(1+2a_3\Big) \\
&\quad +Cc_0+4a^2c_0\log\Big(1+\frac{d_D(u_1)}{d_D(y_{i+1})}\Big) \\
&\le 9a^2a_5c_0\log\Big(1+\frac{\lambda_D(y_i,y_{i+1})}{d_D(y_i)}\Big).
\end{aligned}\tag{4.24}$$

A necessary condition for (4.24) is $\lambda_D(y_i,y_{i+1})\le a_5^2d_D(y_i)$. Hence by (4.24), we know that

$$k_D(y_i,y_{i+1})\le 9a^2a_5\log(1+a_5^2),$$

which contradicts with (4.8). We complete the proof of Claim 3. $\square$

By (4.10) and (4.14)

$$\lambda_{D'}(u'_{0,i},y'_i)\ge d_{D'}(u'_{0,i})-d_{D'}(y'_i)\ge\frac{1}{3a_3}\lambda_{D'}(y'_{i+1},y'_i).$$

Then Claim 2 guarantees that there exists $y'_0\in\gamma'[y'_i,u'_{0,i}]$ such that

$$\frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i,v'_i)}{2a_3}\ge\lambda_{D'}(y'_0,y'_i)\ge\frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i,v'_i)}{3a_3}.\tag{4.25}$$

Hence Lemma 2 implies that

$$\frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i,v'_i)}{2a_3}=\lambda_{D'}(y'_0,y'_i)\le a_3d_{D'}(y'_0).$$

Hence (4.19), (4.20), (4.21) and (4.25)give

$$\begin{aligned}
\log\frac{d_D(q_0)}{d_D(y_0)} &\le k_D(q_0,y_0) \\
&\le Mk_{D'}(q'_0,y'_0)+C \\
&\le Mc'\log\Big(1+\frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_0,q'_0)}{\min\{d_{D'}(q'_0),d_{D'}(y'_0)\}}\Big)+C \\
&\le Mc'\log\Big(1+\frac{\lambda_{D'}(y'_i,v'_i)+\lambda_{D'}(v'_i,q'_0)+\lambda_{D'}(y'_i,y'_0)}{\min\{d_{D'}(q'_0),d_{D'}(y'_0)\}}\Big)+C \\
&\le Mc'\log(1+4a_3+4a_3^2)+C.
\end{aligned}$$

We infer from (4.5) and (4.11) that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} d_D(q_0) & \leq & (1+4a_3+4a_3^2)^{Mc'}e^C d_D(y_0) \\ & \leq & 2(1+4a_3+4a_3^2)^{Mc'}e^C d_D(y_i) \\ & \leq & 2(1+4a_3+4a_3^2)^{Mc'}e^C \lambda_D(y_i,y_{i+1}) \\ & = & \dfrac{2(1+4a_3+4a_3^2)^{Mc'}e^C}{a_6} d_D(v_{i,0}), \end{array}$$

which contradicts with Claim 3. We complete the proof of (4.2).

Then by (4.2) we have for all $i \in \{1,\cdots,t_1+1\}$,

$$\frac{\ell(\gamma[y_i,y_{i+1}])}{2d_D(y_i)} \leq \ell_k(\gamma[y_i,y_{i+1}]) \leq c_0 k_D(y_i,y_{i+1}) \leq a_4c_0, \tag{4.26}$$

which implies that

$$\ell(\gamma[y_i,y_{i+1}]) \leq 2a_4c_0\, d_D(y_i). \tag{4.27}$$

Further, for each $y \in \gamma[y_i,y_{i+1}]$, it follows from (4.26) that

$$\log \frac{d_D(y_i)}{d_D(y)} \leq k_D(y,y_i) \leq c_0 k_D(y_i,y_{i+1}) \leq a_4c_0, \tag{4.28}$$

whence

$$d_D(y_i) \leq e^{a_4c_0} d_D(y).$$

For each $y \in \gamma[y_1,x_0]$, there is some $i \in \{1,\cdots,t_1+1\}$ such that $y \in \gamma[y_i,y_{i+1}]$. It follows from (4.27) and (4.28) yield that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \ell(\gamma[z_1,y]) & = & \ell(\gamma[y_1,y_2]) + \ell(\gamma[y_2,y_3]) + \cdots + \ell(\gamma[y_i,y]) \\ & \leq & 2a_4c_0(d_D(y_1)+d_D(y_2)+\cdots+d_D(y_i)) \\ & \leq & 4a_4c_0\, d_D(y_i) \\ & \leq & 4a_4c_0e^{a_4c_0}\, d_D(y). \end{array} \tag{4.29}$$

By replacing $\gamma[z_1,x_0]$ by $\gamma[z_2,x_0]$ and repeating the procedure as above, we also get that

$$\ell(\gamma[z_2,y]) \leq 4a_4c_0e^{a_4c_0}\, d_D(y). \tag{4.30}$$

The combination of (4.29) and (4.30) conclude the proof of Theorem 1. □

REFERENCES

1. ANDERSON, G.D., M.K. VAMANAMURTHY AND M. VUORINEN, Dimension-free quasiconformal distortion in n-space, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc* **297**(1986), 687–706.
2. O. J. BROCH, Geometry of John disks, Ph. D. Thesis, NTNU, 2004.
3. M. BONK, J. HEINONEN AND P. KOSKELA, Uniformizing Gromov hyperbolic domains, *Asterisque* **270** (2001), 1–99.

4. F. W. Gehring and B. G. Osgood, Uniform domains and the quasi-hyperbolic metric, *J. Analyse Math.* **36**(1979), 50–74.
5. F. W. Gehring and B. P. Palka, Quasiconformally homogeneous domains, *J. Analyse Math.* **30**(1976), 172–199.
6. F. W. Gehring, K. Hag and O. Martio, Quasihyperbolic in John domains, *Math. Scand.* **65**(1989), 75–92.
7. P. Hästö, Z. Ibragimov, D. Minda, S. Ponnusamy and S. Sahoo, Isometries of some hyperbolic-type path metrics, and the hyperbolic medial axis. In the tradition of Ahlfors-Bers. IV, 63–74, Contemp. Math., 432, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.
8. J. Heinonen, Quasiconformal mappings onto John domains, *Rev. Math. Iber.,* 5(1989), 97-123.
9. M. Huang and Y.Li, Decomposition properties of John domains in normed vector spaces, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.***388**(2012),no. 1,191C197. 46B20 (30C65)
10. M. Huang, Y. Li, S, Ponnusamy and X. Wang, The quasiconformal invariant properties of John domains, *arXiv:1108.5550v1 [math.CV].*
11. R. Klén, A. Rasila, and J. Talponen, Quasihyperbolic geometry in euclidean and Banach spaces, Proc. ICM2010 Satellite Conf. International Workshop on Harmonic and Quasiconformal Mappings (HMQ2010), eds. D. Minda, S. Ponnusamy, N. Shanmugalingam, J. Analysis 18 (2011),261–278, arXiv:1104.3745v1 [math.CV].
12. O. Martio and J. Sarvas, Injectivity theorems in plane and space, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math.* **4**(1978), 383–401.
13. R. Näkki and J. Väisälä, John disks, *Expo. Math.* **9**(1991), 3–43.
14. F. John, Rotation and strain, *Comm. Pure. Appl. Math.* **14**(1961), 391-413.
15. A. Rasila and J. Talponen, Convexity properties of quasihyperbolic balls on Banach spaces, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. 37, 2012, 215-228, arXiv: 1007.3197v1 [math. CV].
16. J. Väisälä, Lectures on n-dimensional quasiconformal mappings, Springer-Verlag, 1971.
17. J. Väisälä, Free quasiconformality in Banach spaces. I, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math.* **15**(1990), 355-379.
18. J. Väisälä, Free quasiconformality in Banach spaces. II, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math.* **16**(1991), 255-310.
19. J. Väisälä, Relatively and inner uniform domains, *Conformal Geom. Dyn.* **2**(1998), 56–88.
20. M. Vuorinen, Conformal geometry and quasiregular mappings (Monograph, 208 pp.). Lecture Notes in Math. Vol. 1319, Springer-Verlag, 1988.

Yaxiang Li, Department of Mathematics, Hunan Normal University, Changsha, Hunan 410081, People's Republic of China

E-mail address: `yaxiangli@163.com`